DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 598 SO 028 826

AUTHOR Pak, Yoon K.
TITLE Japanese Americans and the Public School Americanization Program of the Progressive Era: The Seattle Public Schools' Official Attitude, 1916-1942.
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28,1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; Educational Policy; Educational Research; *Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Studies; Higher Education; *Japanese American Culture; *Japanese Americans; *Public Schools; Social Discrimination; United States History
IDENTIFIERS Progressive Era; Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This comparative historical analysis examines the official attitude of the Seattle (Washington) Public Schools toward Americanization and ethnic groups, specifically Japanese Americans, between 1916 and 1942. The paper contains seven major sections including: (1) "Objective and Rationale for Studying Seattle"; (2) "Methodology and Evidence for the Study"; (3) "An Examination of Four Approaches to the Range of Americanization Programs Nationwide"; (4) "Findings of the Seattle Public Schools' Approach to 'Americanism' Based on Primary Evidence"; (5) "Summary and Conclusion"; (6) "Questions for Further Investigation"; and (7) "Where the Current Study Fits with Respect to the Seattle Public Schools 'Unofficial' Approaches to Americanization within the Context of the Japanese American Incarceration in 1942." (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 598

JAPANESE AMERICANS AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AMERICANIZATION PROGRAM OF THE PROGRESSIVE ERA: THE SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS' OFFICIAL ATTITUDE, 1916 - 1942.

BY

YOON PAK

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
MARCH 1997
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

YOON K. PAK

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SO 028 826

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

Japanese Americans and the Public School Americanization Program of the Progressive Era: The Seattle Public Schools' Official Attitude, 1916-1942

INTRODUCTION

The research question for this comparative historical analysis is: What was the Seattle Public Schools' official attitude toward Americanization and ethnic groups, specifically Japanese Americans, between 1916 and 1942? Nationwide, Americanization programs were reaching their zenith during the mass influx of immigration into urban areas and the nation's efforts at instilling patriotic sentiments in schools before and during World War I. In a broad sense "Americanization," or the instilling of a "common culture," had always been a function of public schools[1]. During World War I, however, explicit Americanization programs, with an emphasis on loyalty, as well as acculturation, became prevalent in U.S. schools. Partly as means for social control *and* as a genuine way to respond to growing social crises, educators felt a desperate need to do something about the influx of new immigrants. To be sure, Seattle Public Schools were not immune to national events and its schools were equally affected.

The organization of this paper, in addressing the nature of the Seattle Public Schools' official attitude, contains seven major sections: (1) Objective and rationale for studying Seattle; (2) Methodology and evidence for the study; (3) An examination of four approaches to the range of Americanization nationwide utilizing secondary sources; (4) Findings of the Seattle Public Schools' approach to "Americanism[2] based on primary evidence;" (5) Summary and conclusion; (6) Questions for further investigation; and (7) Where the current study fits with respect to the Seattle Public Schools' "unofficial" approaches to Americanization, within the context of the Japanese American incarceration in 1942.

OBJECTIVE AND RATIONALE

The fact that Seattle, and much of the west coast, had a very different immigrant population than did eastern and midwestern cities, and that Seattle had a somewhat different population mix than either Los Angeles or San Francisco, warrants investigation and inquiry into how schools reacted to a growing national challenge: i.e., in educating its youth in the ideals of Americanism. The high percentage of Japanese residents on the west coast, in general, and Seattle, in particular, raises compelling issues with respect to how Americanization programs were enacted in different areas. Primarily due to the proximity of west coast United States to Asia, and the promise of new opportunities, Chinese and Japanese immigrants ventured beyond the great unknown in search for a better life beginning in the mid 1800s.[3]

During the Progressive Era, Seattle and Los Angeles had the highest numbers of Japanese American residents in the United States.[4] The dominant nonwhite group (but not the dominant immigrant

---

[1]A thorough account of the history of the common school movement, including a discussion of the ideological drive for many schools, can be found in Carl Kaestle's *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*.

[2]I will clarify Americanism at a later point in the paper.

[3]For more detailed information on the history of Asian Americans in the United States please see, for example, *Ronald Takaki's Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*; Sucheng Chan's *Asian Americans: An Interpretive Story*; and Roger Daniels: *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850*. These sources describe the reasons for emigration to the U.S. by various Asian groups and how race prejudice in the west coast, in terms of the "unassimilability" of the Asian population - particularly the Chinese and Japanese - led to subsequent anti-Asian and anti-immigration laws.

[4]Hawaii's Japanese American residents comprised an overwhelming 43% of the total population during 1920 but it was a territory and did not receive statehood until 1959 (Tamura, 1993, 38; and Mullins, 1978, 112).

population) in Seattle between the turn of the century and World War II was the Japanese Americans.[5] By 1940 Los Angeles County comprised of more than 36, 866 Japanese Americans; of these, almost two-thirds or 23,321 lived in the city of Los Angeles.[6] Seattle came next, which had almost 7,000 with another 2,700 in surrounding King County and 2,000 more in adjacent Pierce County.[7] Moreover, compared with the total population, the proportion of Japanese Americans was higher in Seattle than in Los Angeles. The following table gives a population breakdown among certain minority and immigrant groups in 1920 in Los Angeles and Seattle:

Table 1: Population of Los Angeles and Seattle's Minority and Immigrant Population in 1920

City of Los Angeles' Minority & Immigrant Population in 1920		City of Seattle's Minority & Immigrant Population in 1920	
Name of Group	# of Inhabitants	Name of Group	# of Inhabitants
Japanese	8,536 (1.5%)	Japanese	7,874 (2.5%)
Chinese	2,062 (0.4%)	Chinese	1,351 (0.4%)
African American	15, 579 (2.7%)	African American	2,894 (0.9%)
Mexicans	21,598 (3.8%)	Filipino	458 (0.1%)
TOTAL LOS ANGELES POPULATION	576,673	TOTAL SEATTLE POPULATION	315,312

(Sources: Raftery, 1992, 12, 70, & 102; and Taylor, 1994, 108)

Figures worth noting in Table 1 are the similar numbers of Japanese and Chinese Americans in both cities. Whereas Los Angeles had much higher numbers of African and Mexican Americans, Seattle contained substantially fewer African Americans and no record of Mexican Americans, but the beginnings of a Filipino population. By 1910, Seattle's 6,127 Japanese were the fifth largest ethnic group after the Canadians, Swedes, Norwegians, and Germans.[8] By 1916, ten churches, a variety of civic and social clubs, and five Japanese-language newspapers served Seattle's Japanese American community and areas beyond.[9]

In other urban areas across the nation, there were higher numbers and greater percentages of immigrants from northern and southern Europe. At the turn of the century, cities in New York, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Missouri had most immigrations from Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Hungary, and

---

[5]Calvin Schmid and Wayne McVey, Jr., *Growth and Distribution of Minority Races in Seattle, Washington* (Seattle: Seattle Public Schools, 1964), 14.

[6]Roger Daniels, *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States Since 1850* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), 156.

[7]Daniels, 157.

[8]Quintard Taylor, *The Forging of a Black Community: Seattle's Central District from 1870 through the Civil Rights Era* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994), 118.

[9]Taylor, 118.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

Czechoslovakia.[10] The number of Asian immigrants were nowhere near the figures of Los Angeles and Seattle. By 1940 in the East, the only sizable Japanese American community was in New York, where some 2,500 lived.[11]

Along the lines of demographic makeup, another rationale for investigating this topic is the extent to which demographic differences influenced how Americanization policies were approached and enacted in different areas. At the outset, it appears that a different population mix, in addition to higher and lesser numbers of immigrant and minority individuals within an urban area did make a difference. How that difference, of schooling for Americanization, is set apart from other areas will be examined for Seattle.

METHODOLOGY AND EVIDENCE

The evidence for investigating the Seattle Public Schools' policy on Americanization comes mainly from superintendents' memoranda, district newsletters, annual reports, and curriculum guides. The documents span nearly two-and-a-half decades from 1916 through 1942; with materials focusing largely in the 1920s and 1940s. The year 1916 is the beginning point for the analysis for that is when Americanization and citizenship training policies and curricula are discussed and given primary import in the Seattle Public Schools' *Annual Reports*. Likewise, other cities and states also began Americanization programs at this time. The year 1942 concludes this analysis as the United States' entrance into the Second World War disrupts many school activities on the west coast, especially with the forced removal of Japanese Americans. Another reason for choosing these dates is that in the time span of roughly twenty-six years the greatest influx of immigration, subsequent anti-immigration policies, and increase in birth rates, especially among the Japanese Americans, occur in Seattle and throughout the west coast.

Examining the nature and content of Americanization programs in the Seattle Public Schools is one way of understanding what the district's official attitude was toward Americanization and ethnic groups, specifically Japanese Americans. The School District's definition of "Americanism" provides a loose framework for beginning the examination process. In addition, the SPS' Annual Reports, the *Principals' Exchange*, and the Superintendent's memoranda all speak to promoting a kind of democratic citizenship education that calls for valuing one's place in society and being responsible members of a democratic community.

The SPS' *Annual Reports* and the Superintendents' memoranda also refer to two main texts, *Living Today - Learning for Tomorrow* and *Successful Living* for teaching and discussing with students the importance of living a democratic life. These guides illustrate the kind of programs and discussion materials the school district intended for all K-12 students to comprehend. The lesson plans and "Desired Outcomes" for students give clear examples of what the district expected from teachers and students.[12]

Complementing the historical analysis of primary sources will be a discussion of secondary sources comparing case studies of Americanization efforts nation-wide. The authors of secondary sources will include: Eileen Tamura's work on Japanese Americans in Hawaii, Judith Raftery's research on Los Angeles, Ronald Cohen and Raymond Mohl's book on Gary, Indiana, and David Tyack and James Thomas' research on the moral majority's influence on the school curriculum during the progressive era. An analysis of these cases are examined in the following section.

---

[10]William J. Reese, *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements during the Progressive Era* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1988), 24-25.
[11]Daniels, 156.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

FOUR APPROACHES TO THE RANGE OF AMERICANIZATION PROGRAMS NATIONWIDE

The range of approaches to Americanization nationwide revealed four key ideas: implantation of Anglo-Saxon conformity; conformity through denigration; segregation and discrimination; and acculturation and social welfare. Beginning with Cubberly's mission on the goal of Americanizers to the programs in Gary, Indiana, Honolulu, Hawaii, and Los Angeles, California, the secondary sources represent different and similar ways for instilling citizenship. These four cases represent a range of programs in place in major urban areas.

Implantation of Anglo-Saxon Conformity: Ellwood Cubberly's National Goal

Ellwood P. Cubberly was a key educational leader who was vociferous in his beliefs about what Americanization in schools ought to consist. His articulation of the goals of Americanizers in 1909 was and is still a speech often cited:

> Our task is to break up these groups or settlements, to assimilate and amalgamate these people as a part of our American race, and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law, and order, and popular government, and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth.[13]

Clearly, Cubberly's interests lay in projecting one kind of an American identity, namely white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant. His reference to "our American race" bespeaks of an elitism which signified that to be an American, living and participating as a citizen in a democracy, is someone who adopts the concept of one race and one culture; everything else would fall short of that ideal. Such was one example, within a continuum, of the national fervor of who and what an American ought to be.

As stated previously, compulsory Americanization did not reach its peak until the decade after World War I. David Tyack and James Thomas refers to this period as "political fundamentalism in education" for many patriotic, civic, and legal organizations such as the American Legion, the Grand Army of the Republic, American Bar Association, Daughters of the American Revolution, the National Security League, and Constitution Anniversary Association, and the Better America Federation worked to secure orthodox political instruction.[14] By 1923 an overwhelming percentage of states prescribed to patriotic instruction or rituals in the following areas: History of U.S. (90%); Citizenship (81%); Flag Displays (81%); and All Instruction in English (73%), among others.[15] Within this structure of mandated public programs, a range of policies and attitudes toward immigrants and Americanization existed within and among different districts. The following cases represent a range of examples which sought means for

---

[12]At this juncture, it is not possible to attain lesson plans of teachers from the 1920s -1940s; although they are public information, the Seattle Public Schools' Archives do not contain any official records.

[13]Ronald D. Cohen and Raymond A. Mohl, *The Paradox of Progressive Education: The Gary Plan and Urban Schooling* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1979), 85.

[14]David Tyack and James Thomas, "Moral Majorities and the School Curriculum: Making Virtue Mandatory, 1880-1930," in Tyack and Thomas, *Law and Shaping of Public Education* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1987), 170-171.

[15]Tyack and Thomas, 171.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

ethnic erasure, a movement for English-only in classrooms, and a social welfare approach to Americanization.

Conformity through Denigration: Gary, Indiana

To be sure, there were key educationists who held extreme nativist views and saw the erasure of the immigrants' cultures as the primary goal. To this end, public schools would serve to meet that objective. Superintendent of Gary, Indiana Schools, William Wirt, "[B]elieved in the schools as Americanizers and as agents of social and cultural conformity."[16] The Gary Schools' classrooms, workshops, the playgrounds, the auditorium, the evening schools, the Saturday schools, and the visiting teacher program all played an integral part in the socialization-Americanization process. Central to the Americanization efforts in Gary schools was the effort to erase ethnic cultures, especially with respect to its immigrant population from southern and eastern Europe.[17] The kind of school life an immigrant child would experience is described as follows:

> Immigrant and second generation children made their first acquaintance with American life in the schools. What they found was not always pleasant. Their languages and cultures were often denigrated by an overwhelmingly WASP teaching force. They suffered daily indignities from native-born American students, who made fun of their speech and dress. Teachers arbitrarily Americanized their names. They were forced to conform to American values and patterns of behavior. In the auditorium period they were subjected to daily doses of patriotic and capitalistic propaganda.[18]

In response to the high percentage of school children who were foreign-born or of foreign-born parents, Wirt noted that the Americanization effort would be by far the most important phase of his work in the early 1900s[19] Minimal efforts were made to institutionalize English language courses at first. Students were just expected to know English and behave appropriately.

It was not until 1912 that the Froebel School was established in Gary, Indiana. It was built in a predominantly immigrant neighborhood to teach English and vocationally-tracked curricula. Cohen and Mohl assert that the curriculum discriminated against immigrant groups for the program of study consisted not of a strong academic emphasis, but mainly of manual training and preparation for labor work.[20] This evidence of segregated schooling does raise the issue of whether or not certain groups of immigrants were receiving inferior education. Certainly, segregated schooling for immigrants were not isolated to the Gary case. The irony of this method lay in assimilation through segregation.

Segregation and Discrimination: Honolulu, Hawaii

Although not yet a state, the territory of Hawaii was also affected by efforts at Americanizing its youth. Eileen Tamura's study, "The English-Only Effort, the Anti-Japanese Campaign, and Language Acquisition in the Education of Japanese Americans in Hawaii, 1915-1940" examines the extent to which

---

[16]Cohen and Mohl, 87.
[17]Cohen and Mohl, 88.
[18]Cohen and Mohl, 88.
[19]Cohen and Mohl, 84.
[20]Cohen and Mohl, 92.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

the English-only effort really dealt with language. Tamura's assertion is that it was really an anti-Japanese drive, targeting the Japanese language and the Nisei[21] while disregarding other non-English languages and the children of other immigrants.[22]

In 1924 Hawaii began designating a set of schools as "English Standard."[23] This movement was similar in ideology to Cubberly's speech and in practice to that of the Gary schools, in that a key group of Hawaiian residents sought to instill a WASP ideal of Americanism and Americanization. Marked by a tumultuous past of a series of conflicts between Japanese American and Caucasian community leaders over the schooling of its youth, the English Standard movement was no exception. For twenty-five years the English Standard schools, located mostly in Honolulu, were developed primarily for European American school children so that they would not be negatively influenced by Hawaiian Creole English and other forms of "non-Standard" English spoken by many non-Europeans. Supporters of the cause saw that the schools would promote "Americanism by protecting the English language and encouraging good speech habits."[24] Critics called the Standard schools un-American due to its discriminatory methods which encouraged race prejudice and marked a backwards turn in the process of acculturation.[25] A key difference in the Hawaii case, from Gary, Indiana, was in its' effort to develop segregated schooling for Caucasian children. The emphasis lay in keeping the whites away from being "contaminated" by the "ways of the natives." Despite the generation of a fair amount of dispute, the Standard Schools were not phased out until 1949, when more Middle-class Asians were able to affect change at the legislative level.[26]

Tamura's point is illuminating and raises a provocative question about certain Americanization programs: Were some English-only movements, under the general auspices of Americanization programs, motivated more by race prejudice than by a move to homogenize immigrant groups at large? What is the significance of developing segregated schools for immigrant and Caucasian children? Did it occur in other west coast areas?

Acculturation and Social Welfare: Los Angeles, California

In examining the history of Americanization programs in Los Angeles, however, Judith Raftery gives a different perspective on the range of attitudes and approaches to Americanization represented by different district programs. "Beginning in 1885 with kindergartens and moving through the Depression, Americanization can be seen as a continuing form of social service that both uplifted and assimilated immigrants into American society."[27] The Americanization programs aimed at studying nutritional deficiencies, providing basic medical attention, and for its agents to act as liaisons between immigrant families and social service agencies. In that manner, it resembled the social welfare movement of the social settlement houses much like Jane Addams' Hull House in Chicago, Illinois.

---

[21]Nisei is the term given for the second-generation Japanese, born in the United States. Their parents are the Issei, or first generation immigrants. These generational terms are taken from the Japanese meaning of sei= generation and the prefix from the Japanese numbering system (e.g., ich=one, ni=two, san=three, etc.).

[22]Eileen Tamura, "The English-Only Effort, the Anti-Japanese Campaign, and Language Acquisition in the Education of Japanese Americans in Hawaii, 1915-1940," in *History of Education Quarterly* 33 (Spring 1993), 38.

[23]Eileen Tamura, *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity: The Nisei Generation in Hawaii* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 111).

[24]Tamura, 1994, 111.

[25]Tamara, 1994, 111.

[26]Tamura, 1994, 115.

[27]Judith Raftery, *Land of Fair Promise: Politics and Reform in Los Angeles Schools, 1885-1941* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 195.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

The Home Teacher Act (HTA) of 1915 was a specific Americanization program in Los Angles targeting immigrant women, mothers who normally did not seek English or naturalization classes elsewhere.[28] A notable aspect of this act was that certified teachers, trained in specific courses, were responsible for teaching immigrant women, in addition to being employed at a regular elementary school. Dana Bartlett, Mary Simons Gibson, and Ruby Baughman were basically the operations behind HTA. Their experiences in churches, social settlements, and schools helped to bring a markedly different approach to the home-teacher program than the segregated schooling programs of Gary, Indiana and Hawaii. Raftery characterizes the Los Angeles case by naming "benevolent paternalism:"

> Their [educators and reformers] paternalism was shaped in part by their hope to control immigrants, to set standards for them, to uplift and turn them into acceptable Americans. But in the best sense, true Progressives that they were, they were guided by the optimistic belief that a better life was within everyone's reach and saw themselves, the right-thinking and morally sound, as the medium to make it all possible.[29]

This belief, though elitist in tone, did appear to approach change in the lives of immigrants as one that would concentrate on acculturation more than erasing one's ethnicity.

Some of the lesson plans of the HTA were practical in terms of acquisition of English language competency, but other aspects of the program were questionable. For instance, in an effort to promote middle-class ways, one of the HTA programs taught immigrant women how to set a tea table - quite a contrast to the ways in which the Molokan and Japanese culture approached the tea ceremony. However, an interesting side effect of the program was the hiring of a Chinese-American in 1919 to teach predominantly, but not exclusively, Asian women.[30] This was quite unusual considering the anti-Asian sentiment that prevailed in California (and the Pacific Coast) and the subsequent segregated schooling that would follow.

Baughman, the first supervisor of home teachers, who seemed something of an exception, appeared at times to be quite critical of the philosophy behind Americanization programs and felt genuine concern for the welfare of immigrants. She criticized most Americanizers as domineering with a wrong social emphasis, "Too many people had proposed all manner of things 'to do to him.'"[31] Realizing that the low numbers of immigrant participants perhaps indicated resistance and or indifference, she called for a long-term solution of home teachers becoming personally involved with families over a course of few years.

Unlike other schools in urban areas, some Americanizers in Los Angeles concentrated on broadening their vision of acculturating immigrants to a new culture. Their program reflected more of a social welfare model than that of specific educational programmatic directives. Further, Progressive female leaders played a central role in the implementation of these various programs rather than policies initiated by school superintendents.

A key Americanization effort lay in the implementation of English language instruction, or to develop programs aimed at immigrants who could not speak English fluently. While some programs

---

[28]Raftery, 68.
[29]Raftery, 69.
[30]Raftery, 79.
[31]Raftery, 82.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

seemed to respond to genuine voluntary interest in knowing English on the part of immigrants, other places saw the teaching of English language and the development of English classes as a tool to eradicate the home cultures of certain immigrant groups. The role of race prejudice proved more explicit, as Tamura and Cohen and Mohl contend, in the design of certain Americanization programs than in other places in the United States. Whereas the end result may have been the same, to acculturate immigrants and ethnic minorities to the mainstream through schooling, the means of accomplishing that task varied.

Indeed, Americanization was a term that meant different things to different people in different places. It was highly dependent upon the individual, or group of individuals, in charge of interpreting and implementing the programs as well as on the social, political, and demographic context of the school district. The examples of secondary sources indicate that programs ranged from explicit ways to segregate, conform, and discriminate, to providing social services to individuals beyond the school environment. As people varied in values and beliefs, the programs administered were themselves distinctly individual. Americanization existed along a contiuum. The case for Seattle is no exception.

THE FORMATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AMERICANIZATION PHILOSOPHY & PROGRAMS IN THE SEATTLE SCHOOLS, 1916 - 1927: SIX FINDINGS OF SPS' APPROACH TO "AMERICANISM"

In comparison to the findings of the secondary sources, the case for Seattle is unique and interesting, to say the least. Seattle's efforts at Americanization was focused in six ways: loyalty, civic education, character training, programs for English language competency, the formation of tolerance and prejudice reduction ideas in citizenship, and an emphasis on "multicultural education" in social studies education. Within one district, there was evidence of a range of approaches and change of attitude over time. A brief description of the six major findings are described below.

Loyalty in schools was pushed by a flag law enacted in 1916 whereby all public gatherings had to include flag rituals. The Seattle School, under the leadership of Superintendent Frank B. Cooper was embroiled in a dispute with the Daughters of the American Revolution as to a liberal or literal interpretation of the flag law. Civic education concentrated on a revision of subject matter in history and social studies focusing more on western civilization. Character training was achieved through extra-curricular and non-curricular methods such as flag assemblies, citizenship clubs, and training in thrift. Adult English classes were available in the evenings and the Pacific School was established as a transition school, as opposed to a segregated school, to provide special attention to students with limited English proficiency. Around mid to late 1930s, the district promoted two main curriculum guides with sections emphasizing toleration, prejudice reduction, and multicultural education. All these methods, within the span of more than two decades, defined the Seattle Public Schools' official approach to Americanization.

Loyalty

The beginnings of a formalized Americanization program in Seattle started with a local flag law enacted around 1916 which called for flag exercises to be held in schools. This law could have been drawn from a patriotic legislation making flag ceremonies mandatory at all public gatherings in Seattle.[32] In the schools, the issue over how the flag exercises should be implemented seemed to be a point of contention between the Daughters of the American Revolution and the superintendent of Seattle Public Schools at the time, Frank B. Cooper. In a memorandum to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction,

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

Josephine C. Preston, Cooper defended his position to allow for a loose interpretation of the flag law.[33] The intent of the law was to heighten loyalty and improve "citizenship through respect for the flag and what it stands for."[34] Cooper feared that a:

> Strict observance of this law, to hold flag exercises in every school every week, will defeat the purpose of the law and of its authors. I think the attention of the Daughters of the American Revolution should be called to the fact that there are certain psychological effects unfavorable to accomplishment of the desired end which may have been overlooked in enthusiasm for the end to be achieved.[35]

Cooper's desire, rather, was to uphold the spirit of the law and have individual school principals and teachers implement the program as they saw fit. He wrote that to carry out a literal translation of the flag law would essentially be "perfunctory and tasteless."[36] As in the case of other urban areas across the U.S., the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other civic organizations, sought influence in matters of patriotism in the schools. The era of "political fundamentalism" in schools were evident throughout the nation.

Superintendent Cooper's and the DAR's dispute over the flag law was indicative of various civic and community groups trying to assert its influence over school policies. In the spring of 1916, there was much pressure on the schools to allow for military training as a program in war preparation.[37] Despite opposition and resistance to military training by the Seattle schools, the state legislature placed compulsory military training in high schools in 1917.[38] War preparedness also centered on flag saluting as one its' activities.

Further, volunteer nativist groups, such as the Minute Men, saw as their patriotic duty to influence the ways in which schools were operating. Bryce Nelson highlights four ways in which the Minute Men sought to change school activities:

> First, they were often involved in successful attempts to fire teachers who were unsupportive of the war. Second, they were prominent in the recall of board member Anna Louise Strong. Third, they led the drive to drop German as an elective foreign language. And fourth, they led the drive to drop certain textbooks thought to be pro-German.[39]

In all matters having to do with the character of classroom instruction (as opposed to the character of school board politics), Superintendent Cooper resisted the efforts of nativist groups. However, his judgments were eventually overruled by a more conservative board, and he himself was forced to resign

---

[32]Roger Sale, *Seattle, Past to Present* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976), 118.
[33]The Daughters of the American Revolution seemed to play a central role in promoting a strict flag exercise.
[34]F.B. Cooper to J.C. Preston, 18 February 1916, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.
[35]F.B. Cooper to J.C. Preston.
[36]F.B. Cooper to J.C. Preston.
[37]Bryce Nelson, *Good Schools: The Seattle Public School System, 1901-1930* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), 109.
[38]Nelson, 111.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

in 1922 over some of these issues. Outside group influences, especially during 1916-1921, were no doubt one of many tensions the Seattle Public Schools faced with respect to the implementation of various Americanization programs.

Civic Education

In an effort to be clear on the role of schooling for democracy, the Seattle Public Schools articulated a philosophy of Americanism which served as the foundation for the principles and ideals of a civic life:

> Americanism is more than a system of government; it is the spirit of a national life. The American people believe in self-government tempered with wisdom. They believe also that a nation has a right to live its own life without interference by other nations.[40]

This philosophy was coupled with citizenship training for students that concentrated on revising certain aspects of history and social studies courses to include topics on the Great War, theories of democracy from ancient times to modernity, respecting the flag as the symbol of the United States, and recognizing the importance of sacrificing individual needs for the common good.[41] Superintendent Cooper described the district Americanization program as consisting of civic ideals, flag salutes, and incorporating students' citizenship in the classroom by having it rated by the teachers.[42]

The curricular attention to American and civic ideals was focused more for the first eight grades, with high school students completing courses in history and civics. The intermediate grades, seventh and eighth, gave way to a method of understanding history through narratives, "The story appeal gives way to a more sustained application on the part of the pupil. Civic information is now stressed in relation to its historical background."[43] The reason for this kind of instruction was "primarily to utilize the impressionable years, which are those of the elementary school, for the inculcation of patriotic sentiments and ideals."[44] Loyalty seemed to be an underlying theme here as well. In classroom practices, rather than rote memorization of dates, capitalizing on central themes - with the U.S. Constitution and the state of Washington's as the foundation - were what broadly constituted the social studies and history core.

Acculturation Through Transitional Education:
Adult English Language Classes and the Pacific School

Simultaneous with curricular changes were programmatic additions in the Seattle schools. In particular were Americanization classes for adults aimed specifically at foreign mothers of immigrant school children, along the lines of the Home Teacher Act of Los Angeles. Superintendent Cooper proposed to establish English classes for the foreign mothers so that the ideals of Americanism would flow down to subsequent generations. Cooper contends that:

---

[39]Nelson, 117.
[40]*Quinquennial Report of the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1* (City of Seattle: Seattle, 1921), 86.
[41]*Quinquennial Report*, 87.
[42]F.C. Cooper to the Board of Directors (BOD), 28 January 1921, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.
[43]*Triennial Report of the Public Schools, 1924- 1927* (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1927), 18.
[44]*Triennial Report of the Public Schools, 1921- 1924* (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1924), 16.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

> As part of one general scheme for the promotion of good citizenship and sound Americanism we shall begin this year along with our regular program of instruction of children in the principles and practice of the civic virtues, with the awakening of a sense of obligation among the children of non-English speaking parents to encourage their parents to learn our national language and to become interested in and acquainted with American ideals and institutions. This, in order that a better and safer national heritage may be left to the children for whom our foreign born parents are making a home. Any really effective scheme of Americanisation must include reaching the home of foreign people using a language other than the English, in our community, and one influential means of reaching such homes is by way of the mothers and through the cooperation of the children attending American schools from those homes.[45]

This message seems to indicate a kind of "benevolent paternalism" much like the case of Los Angeles by way of acculturating rather than invoking a strict adherence to who counts as an American. At the same time, however, there are indications of promoting the WASP American ideal based on Cooper's reference to "our national language" and "our community." He is not clear on who exactly comprised the "our." Perhaps Cooper is careful to keep much of the language vague.

In less than two months from when the memo was written, Americanization classes were offered as part of the Evening School curricula. The courses offered were: (1) "English for Foreigners;" (2) American history, civics, geography, and literature; (3) Naturalization classes for men and women who wished to get their final citizenship papers.[46] The extent to which Cooper desired to target the mothers is unknown, but by 1921 the Seattle schools offered Americanization classes (twelve months in the year) for those wishing to attain citizenship and for foreign mothers who desired to learn English and to know American custom.[47]

Once again, one question that arises is: specifically for whom were the programs targeted? There is the general description of reaching out to non-English speaking students and adults, but beyond that, who were the superintendent and Board of Directors concerned with? A partial answer to that query may lie in the Board's request to provide information on Asian students in the Seattle Schools. In 1920, there were a total of 930 Asian students reported, consisting mainly of 704 Japanese (76%) and 166 Chinese (17%) students.[48]

Additional evidence in response to the question, for whom the programs were designated, points in the direction of a transition school called the Pacific School, which were "distinct classes for newly arrived young foreigners who sought admission to the day classes."[49] The *Triennial Report* of 1921-1924 highlights the establishment of the Pacific School around 1909 and paraphrases a principal when discussing the nature of the school and its instructional methods:

> The Japanese form the largest group; the Chinese the second; the Russians the third in point of number; with individuals from many European countries. These pupils are not

---

[45] F.B. Cooper to the BOD, 24 September 1919, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.
[46] *Seattle School Bulletin*, v7, n1, (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, November 1919), 1.
[47] *Quinquennial Report*, 87.
[48] F.E. Willard to BOD, 12 March 1920, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.
[49] F.B. Cooper to BOD, 13 January 1922, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

> classified according to their knowledge of English for they have too little of that for examinations or tests of any kind. All these factors are considered briefly. An interpreter is called in and some idea is obtained of the applicant's education and intelligence and he is assigned to the group which promises to contribute most for his immediate inspiration to hear and to speak English.
>
> Through these classes the foreign pupils are saved from embarrassment and discouragement and are helped by intensive training to overcome mannerisms and accents that otherwise persist through adult life. . .Return to regular classes is conditioned upon their being able to use the English language reasonably well for the grade assigned.[50]

Unlike the Froebel of Gary Indiana, which permanently segregated students into a vocational track, the aim of the Pacific School was to gradually return all students into the "regular" day classes. There seem to have been tangential discussion concerning the Pacific School and whether or not a permanent building be allocated for the segregation of instruction for foreign students. Cooper thought this proposal by the Board of Directors to be disadvantageous, both from an educational and financial point of view and that an "arbitrary segregation would invite serious embarrassment and complications."[51] Cooper advocated a process of transitioning students into the regular classrooms as swiftly as possible.

By 1922, there were a total of 636 students attending the Pacific School and the majority numbers of student population breakdown is shown below. It is interesting to note how different ethnic groups are categorized:

ETHNICITY	NUMBER / PERCENTAGE	
Jewish Total (Polish, Russian, Spanish, Turkish and Austrian)	164	26%
Japanese	156	25%
U.S. Americans (ethnicity not stated)	153	24%
Chinese	35	0.6%

Source: F.B. Cooper to BOD, 13 January 1922, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

In addition, the Pacific School held students from 26 nationalities and the majority of the children (269 or 42%) were born in the United States of immigrant parents.[52] It would be interesting to investigate how the staff of Pacific School sought students for attendance; were they recruited or chosen from regular classrooms? How did the staff know who was a newly arrived immigrant?

On a peripheral level, looking specifically at the 1920 figure of the Japanese American student population in the Seattle schools at 704, compared to those in the 1922 figures of Pacific School at 156, there still remained an overwhelming number of students who did not need English language training, or at least did not receive it. This also raises more questions: to what extent did the students of Pacific School really need English language training? Were some of the students picked based on their racial identities

[50] *Triennial Report of the Public Schools, 1921 - 1924* (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1924), 74.
[51] F.B. Cooper to BOD, 20 January 1922 Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

and/or from the lack of verbal participation in the classroom? What kind of testing mechanism, if one existed, were in place? How were interpreters chosen and where did they come from? These questions aside, all students of Seattle Public Schools were not only recipients on lessons of loyalty and civics, but also strongly advised by school officials to participate in various extracurricular clubs to develop one's character as a future democrat. Character training was an exercise in developing the "habits of mind."

Character Training

Character training, promoted primarily through non-curricular and extra-curricular methods was characterized by school/flag assemblies, boys' and girls' civic clubs, and programs such as training in thrift.

School / Flag Assemblies as a Means of Citizenship Training

Weekly assemblies in the schools were seen as a way to foster ideals of citizenship. Most Seattle schools held an assembly once a week by reciting a flag salute and giving the pledge of allegiance. Up through the 1940s, it was commonplace for schools to partake in a flag ritual. Often used as a symbol to promote the ideals of Americanism and the "American dream," the flag salute would begin most school mornings. A rare activity prior to World War I, the United States' involvement in the war changed all that. The Seattle School Board placed American flags in classrooms and flag-saluting exercises became common.[53] An abridged form of the ritual by the district is as follows:

Pupil Leader:	Salute the flag! [A salute is given followed by the Pledge of Allegiance]
Leader:	Why do we salute the flag?
Assembly:	Because we desire to honor it.
Leader:	Why should we honor it?
Assembly:	Because it stands for liberty, justice and equal opportunities in life for all those who live under its folds.
Leader:	How can we best show our devotion to the flag?
Assembly:	By obeying the laws of our country.
Leader:	Who are the enemies of the flag?
Assembly:	All persons who strike at our flag by war or who break the laws that have been made to keep our liberties.
Leader:	What are our duties as citizens?
Assembly:	First, always to defend the honor of our country; second, to obey the laws and see that others obey them; and third, always to remember that first of all we are American citizens, whose duty it is to stand by our country and keep its flag free from dishonor.[54]

The approach to this particular form of Americanization rested on having students understand the flag as a symbol of civic ideals and patriotic loyalty. The justifications for conducting flag ceremonies

---

[52]F.B. Cooper to BOD, 13 January 1922.
[53]Nelson, 111.
[54]*Triennial Report, 1924 - 1927*, 39.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

rested on instilling a sense of duty to country,[55] training for immediate and prospective citizenship as a member of a community, and increasing pride in the students' schools. It was thought that these participatory efforts would make for more intelligent citizens (through daily reminders of what Americanism consists), and overcome some narrowness of character by realizing one's responsibility as a citizen within a democratic neighborhood; to see that individual action or inaction does affect the community positively or negatively[56] School officials expressed the importance and value of these exercises as fostering positive democratic values, but the extent to which the students truly valued the ceremonies remain open for investigation.

Pupil Participation in School Government and Habit Training through Citizenship Clubs

Extracurricular activities through Good Citizenship Clubs, Boys' Clubs, and Girls' Clubs were as additional ways to promote Americanization ideals. The aim here concentrated on developing the democratic character. One of the foundational conditions of these clubs required that students abide by a code of conduct which would promote values of a "good citizen." School personnel often encouraged students to join in the civic clubs. Certain schools had a "Standards Committee" that considered ways and means for establishing standards of conduct. An example of the kinds of standards the students had to abide by are as follows:

MY CREED

I believe, as a High School girl of Seattle, I should be
Joyous, courageous and courteous.
Truthful, considerate and just.
Loyal and sincere in friendship.
Too noble to speak ill of others.
Willing to forgive and forget.
Prompt and gracious in obedience.
Ready to do all possible service.
Quick to appreciate what is done for me.
Respectful to my elders.
True to the best that is within me that
I may become a fine and worthy woman.[57]

As participation in civic clubs promoted good habits for conduct in the public sphere, training in thrift provided lessons in how to manage one's financial affairs.

Training in Thrift

The thrift component of the regular "Course of Study in Citizenship" grew from the schools' sale of Thrift Stamps and Liberty Bonds as a part of their service during World War I. It was not until March 13, 1923, however, that a definite school savings plan was adopted and put into operation in all high and

---

[55] *Triennial Report, 1921 - 1924*, 15.
[56] *Triennial Report, 1924 - 1927*, 39-40.
[57] *Triennial Report, 1924 - 1927*, 42.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

elementary schools.[58] The feature of the school savings plan called for weekly "bank days" for pupils to make deposits. The emphasis lay more on learning the habit of saving, rather than on the amount deposited, whereby the act of saving would build character, deemed an "American" virtue. The savings plan was a voluntary effort by the students, and by the district's account most schools were reporting anywhere from 70 to 100 percent of the student body making deposits.[59] Another lesson school personnel hoped students would learn from the savings plan was that upon leaving high school, graduates would know how to earn, save and invest money, thereby contributing to the economic revitalization of their community. A Thrift Committee was developed by the Superintendent to report on the school savings plan and it indicated that students were learning the value of money and were budgeting whatever small incomes they had.[60]

In Los Angeles, school savings banks were introduced a early as 1900 and by the time the Depression hit, many bankers felt that the savings concept needed reinforcing.[61] The Americanizers of Los Angeles felt that "given the opportunity and intelligent guidance," immigrants could "best Americanize themselves when left to their own devices and to the skills and ingenuity of the native leaders."[62] One such service offered by the schools was the opening and maintaining of savings accounts by children. A good citizen, developed through particular habits of character education, was essentially made and not born. Likewise, subject matter emphasis on how schools ought to educate for effective citizenship were ever more explicit in the 1930s.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW CONCEPTS IN THE 1930s: "PREJUDICE REDUCTION" AND "MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION"

Ideas of "prejudice reduction" and "multicultural education," two modern-day terms, were introduced in the official curriculum guides of the Seattle Public Schools in the mid and late 1930s. The guides' emphases concentrated on developing the democratic character of the individual student and learning the virtues of democracy as expressed in the social studies and geography education. The approach to this new type of citizenship education rested on progressive ideals incorporating the life experiences of students, inclusion of narrative history as a pedagogical method, and inclusion of free discussion on aspects of democracy.

Primary documents on Americanization programs in the 1930s are lacking in this collection. The district annual reports in that decade contained no mention any Americanization nor citizenship training programs. It is more likely that with the Great Depression and subsequent teacher salary cuts, the Seattle Public Schools were embroiled in deep budget woes. For a time, the Bulletin was suspended from September 1932 to March 1934.[63] As in New York City, Seattle teachers were asked to "'donate' a part of their pay, their time, and their good-will."[64] Without a doubt, other district staff salaries and programs suffered from financial exigencies.

---

[58] *Triennial Report, 1921 - 1924*, 16.
[59] *Triennial Report, 1921 - 1924*, 17.
[60] *Triennial Report, 1924 - 1927*, 36.
[61] Raftery, 240.
[62] Raftery, 163-164.
[63] Dominic W. Moreo, *Schools in the Great Depression* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1996), 86.
[64] Moreo, 87.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

Curriculum-wise, Superintendent McClure reportedly adapted a modified version of the "platoon system" in Seattle schools began by Superintendent William A. Wirt in Gary, Indiana, before the First World War.[65] The result amounted to limited specialization in the lower grades whereby the teachers were relieved of certain duties by having others teach music, physical education and fine arts.[66] This may have been a way to offset teachers having to "volunteer" one's salary.

Despite the financial hardship felt by the Depression, the Seattle Schools were doing what it could to maintain its tradition of Americanization and citizenship. During this time two main curriculum guides were often referred to as the means for learning citizenship and Americanism. They are *Successful Living* and *Living for Today - Learning for Tomorrow*.

Successful Living

Successful Living, published in 1935, was developed by a committee of teachers to pass down a cohesive set of ideals on Americanization, namely through character education. According to the authors, character education was to be thought of, "like health, as the productive way of living through which strength is acquired. Character education in America is the mastery of a truly democratic way of living . . . a way of living which conserves and produces as many values as possible for as many persons as possible over as long a time as possible. Character education is the facilitation of this way of life."[67]

Central themes the committee introduced in the text are: Knowing and Doing, The "Either-Or" Fallacy, Opportunities in the Classroom, The Teacher as Counselor and Friend, School Life and Democratic Living, Play and Democratic Living, Changing Time and Ethical Principles, and Coordinating the Out of School Life. These introductory sections do not offer concrete examples of what is to accomplished. Rather, the idea or theory of why these ideas should be introduced and enforced in the classroom are discussed.

1. Knowing and Doing was concerned with how preparation for the work force diminished the importance placed on the "classical curriculum" and that emphasis should be placed on citizenship education, a combination of both classical knowledge and a practical one. The adage of "knowledge is power" was quoted as emphasizing the point of developing the intellect.

It is ironic that preparation for the workforce is mentioned considering that employment was scarce and many teachers were "volunteering" their time to teach. Perhaps it was the uncertainty of attaining employment after graduation that schools focused more on a "liberal arts" education.

2. The "Either-Or" Fallacy sought to draw connections from two seemingly oppositional ways of thinking: of how the everyday world of the classroom contributed to society's broader objective. It states that, "No pupil can attain the highest mental development of which he is capable without establishing habits of accuracy, self-reliance, patience, and industry - essentials of good character."[68] It relied on efforts to not choose between a "classical" versus a "vocational" education, but rather, to interweave the two. The classroom would be the place where everyday habits of mind, character growth, would develop.

3. Opportunities in the Classroom approached ways to explore the world of possibilities in which to look at history, literature, and biography. The authors of the text explained that character

---

[65]Moreo, 86.
[66]Moreo, 87.
[67]*Successful Living* (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1935), 1.
[68]*Successful Living*, 3.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

education can be built from the learning of historical figures who themselves modeled characteristics worthy of replication. However, no clear examples of historical figures are mentioned in this section.

4. The Teacher as Counselor and Friend looked at the need for recognizing possible challenges students came to class regarding their home or personal life. The committee felt that the role of the teacher needed to expand beyond the curriculum to see to it that the student(s) received whatever outside help necessary in order to function in the classroom environment. The welfare of the student is seen as a legitimate means for how pedagogy should be conducted.

5. School Life and Democratic Living attributed some of its ideas to John Dewey in that the school offered a place to equalize opportunities for all children in terms of prejudice reduction of various sorts. The committee saw the school, "serving all the children of all people, has a unique opportunity for overcoming snobbery, reducing racial and class prejudices, and teaching the brotherhood of man."[69] They continued to state, "The individual must gain a consciousness of his civic responsibilities. Dewey reminds us of the fact that school is not only a preparation for life; it is life itself. It may be so organized as to afford opportunity for the exercise of all the duties and obligations of citizenship."[70] This is the first indication where reducing racial and class prejudices is directly connected to democratic citizenship education. This perhaps reflects the nature of changing attitudes over time.

6. Play and Democratic Living concerns itself with the fear that the shortening of work hours will result in "slovenly" behavior and that the role of schooling lies in offering "productive" ways to engage in play. It offers ways to enjoy nature and finding time to create an interest for the great outdoors. The aspect of play and fun has an educational and purposeful activity to them.

7. Changing Times and Ethical Principles deals with developing ways to lead an ethical and moral life. The authors loosely define them as encouraging boys and girls to practice honesty, thrift, loyalty, and tolerance. They see this not as a fixed definition, but a place where discussion of why one may agree or disagree as a beginning point for discussion. Similar to "School Life and Democratic Living," tolerance is mentioned as an important characteristic of ethical and moral principles of democracy.

8. Coordinating the Out-of-School Life once again sees the problem of idleness as a great threat to the healthy development of the productive citizen. Successful living has everything to do with ensuring that free-time is not spent on evil activities such as looking at "cheap and vulgar" magazines, drinking intoxicating liquor, and listening to the radio with its "insidious suggestion of pseudo-smartness and false standards of living.[71] It acknowledges and denigrates the power of popular culture to significantly influence the minds of the young.

The incorporation of progressive education ideals coupled with the Protestant and capitalist work ethic makes for an interesting perspective on how education for character ought to be developed in the Seattle Schools. The particular fixation on leisure time and how it should not be spent in idle wandering, but rather on "productive play" through the arts and nature, is perhaps a social commentary on how the authors saw the status of the youth of America during the Depression. It was a time for every individual to work and contribute toward a common good. Any deviation from that ideal would make for an unproductive citizen and an ineffective member of a community.

The multiple approaches and attitudes toward Americanization represented by *Successful Living* reiterated old themes and introduced new ones. Although specific activities such as flag salutes and

---

[69] *Successful Living*, 4.
[70] *Successful Living*, 4.

participation in civic clubs were not mentioned, broad notions of character education reflected the "Protestant work ethic" and efficient use of leisure time. New ideas introduced in education for character consisted of toleration, open discussion, equalizing of opportunities in terms of prejudice reduction, and recognizing the student's welfare and the personal life experience they bring to the classroom. Much of these themes are also given attention by the other curriculum guide.

Living Today - Learning for Tomorrow

Living Today - Learning for Tomorrow , published in 1938,[72] is the Seattle School's curriculum guide for a course in social studies from the kindergarten through the senior high school. It is broken down by semester-long increments which provides a general description of the subject to be taught, approximate time allotments for certain topical areas, materials of instruction - basic bibliographic listing, and desired outcomes for each grade and semester level.

There are three reasons given for using the guide across all grade levels: (1) The Student Learns About the World in Which He Lives; (2) The Student Experiences Civic Teamwork; (3) The Student Gains Perspective and Lasting Interest in the World and Its People.[73] The emphasis is on familiarizing students with their local geography and seeing how their place in the local community shapes things on a global level.

The understandings to be achieved by learning this particular brand of social studies are to be "arrived at naturally through the illustrative content activities of the social studies program."[74] The desired understandings for the program were: (1) Interdependence; (2) Changing Environment; (3) Man's Power to Control Nature; (4) Obligations of Democracy; (5) Free Discussion; (6) The Individual and Society; (7) Shifting Populations; and (8) Cause and Effect.[75] Again, the focus of the social studies program begins with the notion that we are all mutually dependent and that what we do to change or control the environment has effects that we may not necessarily be able to control in the end. From that standpoint, it is all the more important to see that citizens in a democracy have particular obligations to fulfill. A brief explanation of the understandings are discussed in the following sections.

1. Interdependence focuses on mutual dependency of individuals. The authors write that "Civilization is the product of the contribution of many races and peoples."[76] To be sure, this phrase at least attempts to recognize the multiethnic contributions of different cultures.

2. Changing Environment discusses the role of human nature's slow accommodation to changes in the environment and that "Resistance to change and unreceptivity to new ideas often result in revolution by violent measures."[77] The exact meaning of the quoted sentence is unknown, although there is the intimation that war is at times inevitable, given "that there seems to be an unjustifiable lag in human progress toward finer ways of living."[78]

---

[71] *Successful Living*, 6.
[72] The same year in which John Dewey's *Experience and Education* was published.
[73] *Living Today - Learning for Tomorrow (LTLT)* (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1938), 12-14.
[74] *LTLT*, 15.
[75] *LTLT*, 15.
[76] *LTLT*, 16.
[77] *LTLT*, 16.
[78] *LTLT*, 16.

3. Man's Power to Control Nature is considered an outstanding aspect of modern history and that social control remains the "unsolved problem" of modern man.[79] Control over the physical and social environment seems to take on positive values of social betterment in this context.

4. Obligations of Democracy considers the particular role of the individual to partake in the civic duties of democracy. Voting is seen as a privilege and that possessing rights and privileges as a citizen "imply obligations and sacrifices."[80]

5. Free Discussion plays on the variation of the freedom of speech theme. It promotes tolerance and striving for intelligent understanding through the diversity of ideas. The previous category and this one emphasizes the importance of civic participation and makes explicit how a citizen ought to engage in such responsibilities.

6. The Individual and Society is concerned with comprehending "man's" need to harmonize two opposing forces where one is motivated by competition and the need to maintain one's individuality, and by the obligation and responsibility toward society and recognizing the need for cooperation.[81] The challenge of democracy lies in integrating both.

7. Shifting Populations acknowledges people's need to be mobile in search of better opportunities and more favorable conditions. Thus geography has a particular place in social studies.

8. The Cause and Effect interrelationship of the natural history and people's role in it signifies the importance of knowing the past to survive the present, and to build a better future, however unknown.

The seventh and eighth grade history curriculum have similar desired outcomes and understandings to be achieved. The curriculum committee sought to have students comprehend and relate a connected historical narrative, recognize character traits of outstanding world characters - Moses, Socrates, Christ, Paul, Pericles, have knowledge of and respect for ancient texts, appreciate the long struggle for democracy, and have a sympathetic attitude to the long struggle of man to improve and overcome obstacles in order to benefit society.[82]

The geography curriculum for these grades concentrates on an introductory study of the state of Washington as well as a strong recommendation to the study of East Asia. The main character growth outcomes for learning geography are to gain a sympathetic understanding of other people which comes from a study of their problems and an appreciation of how men, by working together, can, to a certain degree, control nature and improve conditions.[83] Exactly how one would control nature is not explained fully.

In its entirety, these two texts seem to represent a moderate, citizenship-based approach to Americanization. In comparison to Cubberly's mission statement, the segregative element of the Gary Schools, and the English-only effort of Hawaii's schools, Seattle schools in the 1930s also seem to have assumed a more moderate, pluralistic attitude toward difference and diversity. Couple of places in the texts refer to the critical understanding of differences through discussion, and schools as places for opening up of opportunities for all races and economic classes. There is no explicit move to erase the cultures of immigrants, or to amalgamate the races, though there probably continued to be an implicit effort to acculturate immigrant students in the Seattle schools to that of the mainstream culture through

---

[79] *LTLT*, 16.
[80] *LTLT*, 17.
[81] *LTLT*, 18.
[82] *LTLT*, 73.
[83] *LTLT*, 82.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

various extra-curricular activities. Another area to conduct further research centers on examining how the Seattle Schools' attitude toward Americanization changed over time, particularly between 1916 and the 1930s, with respect to different social, demographic, and political groups' influence on the curriculum and on public policy directives.

However, there are also strands of thought that seem congruent with other national urban cases. The texts' emphases on a strong work ethic coupled with notions of productive play is a Protestant-based ideology in effect in many public schools across the nation. This method suggests that the implicit ends for Americanization would be to instill aspects of the "white" culture into that of the immigrant population; this is not to say, however, that immigrant groups did not honor values of work ethics in their home cultures. Further, it could be paving the way for many students to accept the notion that being an "American" meant suppressing one's ethnicity in favor of the Anglo-Saxon perspective. The study of historical figures as heroes, such as Christ, Moses, Paul, Socrates, and Pericles, point to the tradition of maintaining a narrow brand of character education. Perhaps in an effort to satisfy the progressive *and* traditionalist community advocates, the authors of the two texts sought to appease those interest groups by introducing a broad ideology sure to appeal to both sides.

Like many other curriculum guides, it is difficult to know or investigate the extent to which educators actually used them. At the very least, it may be safe to assume that teachers implemented a modified version of the ideas proposed, each teacher using what was most favorable to them. Further, knowing how much the students actually learned and understood aspects of character education from their teachers is problematic as well. Other issues to consider are how these texts were placed in terms of Americanization programs as a whole by the district and by the changing attitudes of the Superintendents, the School Board, and community members over time.

WORLD WAR II AND AMERICANIZATION POLICY DIRECTIVE FOR THE SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In 1941, Superintendent Worth McClure distributed a special bulletin to the principals of Seattle Schools regarding the teaching of the social subjects. A policy measure was unanimously adopted by the School Board to use *Living Today - Learning for Tomorrow* in all schools.[84] The reason for its use is summarized in the introductory paragraph:

> The teaching of history, geography, civics, and economics was probably never more vital to American democracy than at the present time. At the same time, it is also true that the impact of current world events upon the public emotions inevitably exposes the teaching of these subjects to a continuous hazard of misunderstanding. The present situation, therefore, lays certain responsibilities upon the School Board and the school corps.[85]

Perhaps the beginnings of another war hysteria brought the focus of Americanization and citizenship education to the fore. The documents at this time once again turn its attention to flag salutes and weekly assemblies as means for instilling such virtues. The flag ritual is another adaptation of the 1920's version:

---

[84]W. McClure to Principals, 13 January 1941, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Flag:	I am your flag.
Children:	We are your children.
Flag:	I represent America.
Children:	We are America.
Flag:	I have given you a land that is great, beautiful, and rich. I have given you liberty, freedom, toleration and opportunity for all. These and more I have given you, but I require: Understanding. You must know your country and her history.
Children:	We will find out what has made America great and what must be done to keep her great.
Flag:	I require: Devotion. Every cause that would make a better country or a better people is your cause.
Children:	We will be loyal to American ideals whether we stand with many or alone, etc.[86]

The flag rituals and other Americanization and citizenship programs take on a more somber tone for the Second World War looms on the horizon. Specifically, the future of the Japanese American school children is tenuous, for in the next few months and years, the course of events would change their lives forever.

In January 16, 1942, Superintendent Samuel Fleming submitted to the Board of Directors a model citizenship training program devised by a school teacher from Broadway High School. Some points worth highlighting deal with many of the same principles of the 1920s such as: Endeavor to understand basic Christian principles (honesty, uprightness, courage, courtesy, etc.); make loafing a thing of the past by taking the initiative and applying themselves diligently to their studies; be alert to the dangers of engaging in idle gossip and in spreading rumors which are intended to confuse us; exercise self-control, dignity, and judgment in all crises; develop a toleration and a consideration for those with whom they have to work; be ready to sacrifice to personal comfort and pleasure for the good of their country; be loyal to their flag, their country, and their government.[87]

Perhaps aspects of these outlying principles were repeated and brought out in the open as schools were preparing for wartime emergencies. The official newsletter of the district expressed concerns over the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 and how that might affect the Japanese American school children. The article states, "Tolerance toward Japanese classmates was stressed. One principal reminded her cosmopolitan student body: 'You were American citizens last Friday; you are American citizens today. You were friends last Friday; you are friends today.'"[88] The school district's response to the crisis seems evenhanded and careful to assure all school children that one should not succumb to the ugliness of war hysteria.

An important piece of evidence comes from an article written by a school teacher of Washington School on "War and the Children."[89] In it she wrote about the Japanese American students and their

---

[85]W. McClure to Principals.
[86]*Seattle Principal's Exchange*, v5, n3 (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, February 1941), 1.
[87]S.E. Fleming to Principals, 16 January 1942, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.
[88]*Seattle Schools*, v18, n5 (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, January 1942), 1.
[89]*Seattle Principal's Exchange*, v6, n7 (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, May 1942), 7-8.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

peculiar place in school and community, considering they comprised 33 percent of the school's enrollment. She states that the war will have a definite impact on the enrollment for 223 students will have been evacuated by May 20, 1942.[90]

The teacher explains that a request went out by the district to over 300 students[91] to write on how they felt about the Internment. The non-Japanese American students were sad to see their friends leave. The Japanese American students wrote of needing to comply with the government's wish but feeling strain over their uncertain future. One girl prayed that her family would stay together during the ordeal.

Despite the horrors of the real world, the principal of Washington School attempted to instill the ideals of democracy and citizenship. She wrote, "The Principal, A.G. Sears, long ago laid the ground work for rooting out any existing prejudices. At all times he has tried to break down cultural barriers, establish mutual appreciation, and develop a program which would lead to a deep devotion to the American way of life. He has stressed a better understanding of all races and religions."[92]

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary, the case for Seattle embodies a moderate, citizenship-based approach to Americanization. Also, the official policy was many things, even in one district - it represented a range. In reference to difference, the official attitude was more pluralistic than the programs in different urban areas at the time. There was the mention of having critical understanding of differences through discussion, and schools as places for opening up of opportunities of all races and economic classes. Also, there was no explicit move to amalgamate or erase ethnic cultures, although there probably continued to be an implicit effort to acculturate immigrant students.

However, within the range of programs in Seattle, the assessment of the primary documents reveals a common strand throughout the decades. The Seattle Public Schools' devotion to Americanism, Americanization, and citizenship training retained a consistent core through curriculum revision, programmatic additions, and extra- and non-curricular activities. Increased immigration, the role of various civic organizations, and the social and political upheavals no doubt played centrally in the schools' desire to implement strategic plans for educating citizens for the school and community life.

The extent to which the programs were inculcating a narrow brand of citizenship, or even pernicious to certain immigrant groups remains an open question. The brief analysis of programs nationwide indicate that for some ethnic groups, Americanization was a euphemism for racial discrimination policies. The Seattle perspective comes solely from an administrative point of view and lacks views from students and non-English speaking parents. Superintendent Cooper's initial desire to celebrate a broad interpretation of the flag law perhaps set the tone for how Seattle would approach the national push for a limited view of Americanization and acculturation. Cooper, it seems, spent time addressing outside groups' interests on how the schools ought to operate in light of wartime events.

To be sure the nation, in general, and Seattle, in particular, did partake in patriotic instructions or rituals as noted by Tyack and Thomas. Popular programs consisted of studying a revised version of U.S. history, learning about citizenship, participating in flag exercises and displays, and classroom emphasis on learning Standard English. Seattle Public Schools enacted various forms of all these curricula.

---

[90] The date by which all Japanese Americans were to report to the Puyallup Detention Center in Puyallup, Washington.
[91] Who exactly the 300 students were is unknown.
[92] *Seattle Principal's Exchange*, May 1942, 7.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

The Seattle case is distinct, not only because of the makeup of its' non-white population, but because of the ways in which various Americanization programs were set in place. It did not express explicit policies of ethnic erasure such as the Gary Schools, a concerted English Standard movement of Hawaii's schools, nor that of the social welfare movement of Los Angeles. A way to characterize the Seattle schools would be in their efforts to straddle the fine line between super-patriotism and liberal progressivism. They practiced a moderate approach to Americanization. It was an effort to merge seemingly contradictory ideologies toward a common goal. On the one hand, there were clear means for instructing Seattle's youth on the Protestant work ethic and instilling a particular brand of Americanism based on loyalty through flag rituals, and the involvement of the individual through civic ideals modeled in other national urban schools. The curriculum content of history and literature emphasized understanding figures from the classical and Judeo-Christian background.

On the other hand, approaches to educating students rested on notions of more "progressive" methods which emphasized a kind of citizenship education that included valuing diversity. Aspects of understanding differences, the study of culture in social studies and geography, and partaking in democratic exercises such as critical dialogue were emphasized. An individual was to recognize the fact that they were but one element in the chain of life. Everyone was interconnected and likewise, one's actions was to reflect the interests of the larger society. In addition, following a more welfare model, the teacher was not necessarily looked upon as an authority figure, but rather as someone to guide the student and to recognize the experiences with which the student came to class. Teachers, at this time, were to respect the home culture of students.

Referring to the well-known labor radicalism that characterized Seattle during World War I, Roger Sale discusses Seattle as a city which somehow became a place of radical ideas at the same time as it experienced growing conservatism.[93] Undoubtedly, the Seattle Public Schools were also places where radical and bourgeois ideals clashed and merged. It was not outside the realm of local and national politics; in fact, the schools were very much a reflection of local politics. Also important at this time are the demographic and social changes that take place in Seattle. Although Japanese Americans formed a large group of immigrants in Seattle, the total immigrant population, and the total non-white population was not as big as in some other cities.

To be fair, the other urban cases were also reflective of their local demographic and political situations. Considering that Seattle was a much younger city,[94] in comparison to that of the eastern, midwest, and other west coast cities, it was still in the midst of developing a local politics of its own. Other urban areas across the United States already had strong, well-established political machines with control over public schools. Further, these areas had to contend with population influx long before the west coast, and programs of Americanization, though not termed specifically that, were implemented in those places. Also, the higher number of immigrant and minority groups in a concentrated, urban area may have contributed to some schools' more segregative approach to Americanization. Although Seattle's Japanese American population was the highest nonwhite population, they did not reach a "critical mass" as in other areas. Seattle was still overwhelmingly a white population and the minority groups were not seen as big of a "threat."

---

[93]Sale, 117.

[94]Seattle was founded on either in November1851 or February 1852, according to Roger Sale, 8.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u washington edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

FUTURE RESEARCH:
"UNOFFICIAL" APPROACHES TO AMERICANIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP

Given the analysis of SPS' official attitude toward Americanization, my next step will focus on Seattle's "unofficial" attitude. I hope to analyze the level of Americanization programs approached in the classrooms and how the students perceived of such ideas. I have in mind one particular school in the 1940s to investigate, Seattle's Washington Middle School. Letters, essays, and journal entries of seventh and eighth grade Japanese American and non-Japanese American students, between 1941 and 1942, are contained in an archival collection compiled by the students' teacher, Ella Evanson. The content of the writings pertain to the impending incarceration of the schools' Japanese American students, and what the writings reveal have direct relationship to issues of Americanization and citizenship.

With Seattle's tradition of Americanization programs in place, the 1940s are important to examine in light of the forced removal of Japanese Americans on the west coast into incarceration camps during World War II. For the Japanese American students, mostly Nisei, and indeed the whole school district, Americanization and citizenship issues were on the front-line. The challenge of theory and praxis in terms of who counted as an American were raised. As the students' writings indicate, the schools seem to have taken the stand that indeed, everyone was an American, despite one's racial and ethnic heritage. The extent to which that actually held true for the Japanese American students in the schools is questionable, to say the least.

That does not mean, however, that participants in those events -- Whites and non-Whites alike -- did not struggle with the apparent tensions and contradictions between U.S. policy and the ideas of Americanization and citizenship promoted in schools. Understanding the ideas of Americanism is a good starting point for exploring how both Japanese Americans and non-Japanese Americans made sense of the incarceration experience. The following farewell letter by a student of Washington Middle School is typical of the sentiments expressed on an uncertain life:

Dear Miss Evanson, *March 24, 1942*

Because of this situation, we are asked to leave this dear city of Seattle and its surroundings. I am sure I will miss my teachers and Mr. Sears [the school principal]. There was never a school like Washington School and I sure will miss it. As for me, the one I will miss most will be you. You have been very patient and kind throughout my work. If the school I will attend next would have a teacher like you I will be only too glad. When I am on my way my memories will flow back to the time I was attending this school, and the assemblies which were held in the hall.

Wherever I go I will be a loyal American.[95]

Love, Emiko Hikida

---

[95]Emiko Hikida, farewell journal entry for the teacher, Ella Evanson , March 24, 1942. Ella Evanson Collection, University of Washington Archives and Manuscripts, Accession #2402.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

PRIMARY SOURCES

Cooper, Frank B. to Preston, Josephine C., 18 February 1916, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Cooper, Frank B. to the Board of Directors, 24 September 1919, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Cooper, Frank B. to the Board of Directors, 28 January 1921, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Cooper, Frank B. to the Board of Directors, 13 January 1922, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Cooper, Frank B. to the Board of Directors, 20 January 1922 Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Ella Evanson Collection. University of Washington Archives and Manuscripts, Accession #2402.

Fleming, Samuel to Principals, 16 January 1942, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Living Today - Learning for Tomorrow. Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1938.

McClure, Worth to Principals, 13 January 1941, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

Quinquennial Report of the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1. City of Seattle: Seattle, 1921.

Seattle Principal's Exchange, v5, n3 (Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, February 1941), 1.

Seattle Principal's Exchange, v6, n7. Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, May 1942.

Seattle Schools, v18, n5. Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, January 1942.

Seattle School Bulletin, v7, n1. Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, November 1919.

Successful Living. Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1935.

Triennial Report of the Public Schools, 1921- 1924. Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1924.

Triennial Report of the Public Schools, 1924- 1927. Seattle Public Schools: Seattle, 1927.

Willard, F.E. to Board of Directors, 12 March 1920, Seattle Public Schools, Archives, Superintendent's Files.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Cohen, Ronald D. and Mohl, Raymond A. *The Paradox of Progressive Education: The Gary Plan and Urban Schooling.* Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1979.

Daniels, Roger. *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988.

Moreo, Dominic W. *Schools in the Great Depression.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1996.

Mullins, Joseph G. *Hawaiian Journey.* Honolulu: Mutual Publishing Company, 1978.

Nelson, Bryce. *Good Schools: The Seattle Public School System, 1901-1930.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988.

©Yoon Pak (yoonie@u.washington.edu), AERA 1997
Do not cite or reproduce without direct permission from author

Raftery, Judith Rosenberg. *Land of Fair Promise: Politics and Reform in Los Angeles Schools, 1885-1941*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Reese, William J. *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements during the Progressive Era*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1988.

Sale, Roger. *Seattle, Past to Present*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976.

Schmid, Calvin F. and McVey, Wayne, Jr. *Growth and Distribution of Minority Races in Seattle, Washington*. Seattle: Seattle Public Schools, 1964.

Tamura, Eileen. *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.

Tamura, Eileen. "The English-Only Effort, the Anti-Japanese Campaign, and Language Acquisition in the Education of Japanese Americans in Hawaii, 1915-40." *History of Education Quarterly* 33 (Spring 1993) : 37-57.

Taylor, Quintard. *The Forging of a Black Community: Seattle's Central District from 1870 through the Civil Rights Era*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994.

Tyack, David and Thomas, James. "Moral Majorities and the School Curriculum: Making Virtue Mandatory, 1880-1930." In Tyack, David and Thomas, James, *Law and Shaping of Public Education*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1987 : 155 - 176.